UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/014,414	01/27/98	GROSS	J JNG-98001

023694   TM02/0920
J. Nicholas Gross, Attorney at Law
Suite 240
1385 Mission Street
San Francisco CA 94103

EXAMINER
PAUL A. C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED:
09/20/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/014,414	GROSS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B PAULA	2176	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _27 August 2001_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _40-58, 60-63, 66-71, 105-114 and 141-204_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _40-58, 60-63, 66-71, 105-114 and 141-204_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/27/2001.

This action is made Non-final.

2.   Claims 1-35, 72-104, and 115-140 have been canceled. Claims 40-58, 60-63, and 66-71, 105-114, and 141-204 are pending in the case. Claims 40, 53, 61, 105, 109, 141, 148, 152, 158, 159-161, 166-167, 178-179, 186, 189, 192, 195, 197, 199, 201, and 203 are independent claims.

3.   The rejections of claims 40, 45, 47, 50, 66, 69, 109, 111, 114 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw et al (Pat. # 5,835,722, 6/27/ 96) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the newly found prior art. '

4.   The rejections of claims 48-49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw et al (Pat. # 5,835,722, 6/27/ 96), in view of Newbold et al (Pat. # 5,576,955, 6/7/ 95, disclosed by Applicants) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the newly found prior art.

5.   The rejections of claims 48-49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw et al (Pat. # 5,835,722, 6/27/ 96), in view of Newbold et al (Pat. # 5,576,955, 6/7/ 95, disclosed by Applicants) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the newly found prior art.

6.   The allowance of claims 53-58, 60-63, 66-71, 105-114, and 141-204 have been withdrawn by a <u>newly found</u> prior art.

Drawings

7.   The drawings filed on 1/27/98 have been approved by the draftsperson.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims, 40, 45, 47, 50, 66, 69, 111, 114, 145-146, 171, 176, 181-182, and 184 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw et al (Pat. # 5,835,722,

6/27/ 96).

Regarding independent claim 40, Bradshaw et al disclose a *cpu, and memory* for

executing, and storing a word checking software routines or modules for detecting offensive

words—(col. 5, lines 3-24, and col. 6, lines 1-67).

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out, and *(i) retrieving* offensive words—

filter word—from a document, and *(ii) determining* whether these words are present in one or

more libraries--"the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along

with offensive words......E-mail can be controlled by prohibiting E-mail to certain addresses,

and enabling a supervisory adult to monitor incoming and outgoing E-mail" (Col. 3, lines 4-67).

Moreover, Bradshaw et al teach the selection of a language filter, and *(iii) control of*

email based on the type of document being utilized a user: email (unpublished document), word

processor, video game, vulgarity, files accounts, etc--document by document basis. Bradshaw et

al also teach the customizing or adjusting the filters based on the recipient using the computer,

e.g., child, employee, etc-- "monitor data being passed into and out of the topmost application

and compare the data stored to that stored in libraries…The third library contains prohibited

words, i.e., profane and vulgar words, racial slurs and epithets, as well as any <u>other words that a</u>

<u>supervisor may wish to have intercepted</u>" (Col. 6, lines 2-67).

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, Bradshaw et al disclose: *generating an*

alert indicating that a word in the document is in said set of filter words— "Alternate blocking

routines may include routines that…..intervening with only a temporary warning screen, or

audible warning…" (Col. 9, lines 32-36). Bradshaw et al teach that "the X-Stop monitoring

system" could have also given visual or audible warning to the user about the presence of an

"offensive"--'potentially inappropriate'-- word.

Regarding claim 47, which depends on claim 40, Bradshaw et al disclose "The data is

compared to the appropriate library and if there is a match in a library" (Col. 6, lines 18-20).

Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose: *verifying the spelling of words*. However, it would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

performed this step, because Bradshaw et al teach matching a 'potentially inappropriate' word

with the words in a "library" or 'dictionary'. In the process of finding a match, the system had to

check the spelling of the word in the document against the spelling of the words in the

"libraries".

Regarding claim 50, which depends on claim 40, Bradshaw et al disclose "Libraries 1, 2,

and 3 are read from the hard-disk into the volatile computer memory (RAM) to allow reading of

the libraries by the sentinel modules without materially slowing down the system" (Col. 8, lines

17-21). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose *word is checked substantially immediate in time*

after it is input into said document. However, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have performed this step, because

Bradshaw et al teach loading the "libraries"—'dictionaries'—into the RAM memory for a fast or

'immediate in time' match of the 'potentially inappropriate' word.

Claims 54, and, 58 are directed towards an article of manufacture for implementing the

system found in claims 47, and 50, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 66, 69, 111, and 114 are directed towards a system for implementing the system

found in claims 46, 50, 40, and, 40 are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 145-146 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in

claims 45, and 40 and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 171, and 176 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in

claims 45, and, 50 are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 181-182, and 184 are directed towards a method for implementing the system

found in claims 45, 47, and, 50 and are therefore similarly rejected.

10.   Claims 160-164, and 166 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bradshaw et al (Pat. # 5,835,722, 6/27/96), in view of Duffy, and further in view of Mogilevsky

. (Pat. # 5,649,222, 5/8/95, disclosed by Applicants).

Regarding independent claim 160, Bradshaw et al disclose "the use of words

inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words", and "The user

is in a word processing application and types 'mukky'. The keyboard sentinel detects the typing"

(Col. 3, lines 4-67, and Col. 11, lines 29-31). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose *word*

checking an electronic document generated by a word processing program. However,

Mogilevsky discloses "Spell checking is much easier for the user because it occurs

automatically" (Col. 2, lines 2-17, and Col. 1, lines 47-67). It would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of

Bradshaw et al and Mogilevsky, because Mogilevsky teaches that spell checking a word—'word

checking'--automatically is much easier on the author such as the supervisor which uses a

computer for communicating with users through documents created on the system being

monitored for improper or offensive words.

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose '....a table identifying offensive and /or potentially

inappropriate words used in a document'-- "....the use of words inappropriate for a key word

search are screened out along with offensive words......" (Col. 3, lines 4-67). Bradshaw et al

fail to explicitly disclose: 'storing word-checking status information......'. However, Mogilevsky

discloses: "The spell checker stores status codes in a table" (Col. 1, lines 57-59). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined

the teachings of Bradshaw et al and Mogilevsky, because Mogilevsky teaches ".... status codes

in a table identifying whether ranges of a characters have been checked" (Col. 1, lines 57-59).

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose "....the use of words inappropriate for a key word

search are screened out along with offensive words......" (Col. 3, lines 4-6). Bradshaw et al fail

to explicitly disclose 'monitoring interaction between said user and said word processing

program to identify idle editing periods'. However, Mogilevsky discloses "...a method for

performing spell checking in the background.....to spell checking a document during idle

periods......" (Col. 1, lines 49-52). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al and

Mogilevsky, because Mogilevsky teaches "The background speller makes efficient use of processor time ......" (Col. 2, lines 11-14), and for word checking documents created by the author such as the supervisor which uses a computer for communicating with users through documents created on the system being monitored for improper or offensive words.

.Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose: *locating offensive and/or potentially inappropriate words in said document*......-- "....the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words......" (Col. 3, lines 4-6).   Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose 'locating potentially inappropriate words in said document during idle periods, and updating the word checking status.....'. However, Mogilevsky discloses "...a method for performing spell checking in the background.....to spell checking a document during idle periods......" (Col. 1, lines 49-52) "The spell checker stores status codes in a table identifying whether ranges of a characters have been checked or not......" (Col. 1, lines 57-59). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al and Mogilevsky, because Mogilevsky teaches ".... status codes in a table identifying whether ranges of a characters have been checked ......", and "The background speller makes efficient use of processor time ......" (Col. 1, lines 57-59, and Col. 2, lines 11-14).

Further, Bradshaw et al disclose "X-Stop.....monitors data being created ......" (Col. 6, lines 15-35), and "The 'user' may be a child, student , or company employee......" (Col. 3, lines 4-6). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose 'modifying a word filter electronic dictionary containing said offensive and/or potentially inappropriate words...'. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had selected

this word, because Bradshaw et al teach screening out—'checking'-- words according to their

meaning—"inappropriate or offensive" as defined by a supervisor based on the identity of the

users of the computers.

Furthermore, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out offensive words in a document

through the use of libraries-- (col. 3, lines 4-67, and col. 4, lines 1). Bradshaw et al fail to

explicitly disclose *permitting a user to specify a rating threshold which must exceeded in order*

for said word to be identified as offensive and/or potentially inappropriate. However, Duffy

teaches designating several categories of offensiveness for words found in a database, and if the

word exceeds a specified threshold (such as 0.0), then the word is marked as offensive (col.3,

lines 48-67, and col. 4, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw, and Duffy

teaches the rating of objectionable documents by monitoring objectionable words in a document

based on the sum of individual word ratings (col. 1, lines 47-67, and col. 2, lines 1-40).

Claim 161 is directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 160,

and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 162, which depends on claim 161, Bradshaw et al disclose: "The

clipboard sentinel detects the passage of the prohibited word through the clipboard and blocks

the system" (Col. 11, lines 36-40). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose: *said result is*

communicated before the user has completed data input. However, it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have checked the word

before input of next word, because Bradshaw et al teach that the purpose of the invention was to

prevent access to inappropriate activities such as typing obscene words, or trying to access pornographic web sites, so that detection would have been fast enough to stop these activities.

Regarding claim 163, which depends on claim 161, Bradshaw et al disclose: *the user is precluded from inputting additional words in said document until corrective action has been taken for such word*--"The blocking routine is designed to prevent any further use of the computer system by a user unless a supervisor intervenes to deactivate X-Stop..." (Col. 6, lines 50-54). Bradshaw et al teach that their invention prevented the user from inputting any further words until the intervention of a "supervisor" to unlock the computer—' corrective action has been taken for such word'.

Regarding claim 164, which depends on claim 161, Bradshaw et al disclose "the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words", and "The user is in a word processing application and types 'mukky'. The keyboard sentinel detects the typing......" (Col. 3, lines 4-67, and Col. 11, lines 29-31). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose: *the result of this spelling check is communicated to the user while said user is still entering said text*. However, Mogilevsky discloses: "Spell checking is much easier for the user because it occurs automatically" (Col. 2, lines 2-8, and Col.1, lines 48-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al and Mogilevsky, because Mogilevsky teaches that spell checking a word—'word checking'--automatically is much easier on the author such as the supervisor which uses a computer for communicating with users through documents created on the system being monitored for improper or offensive words.

Claim 166 directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims (45+164), and are therefore similarly rejected.

11.   Claim 165 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw et al, in view of Duffy, further in view of Mogilevsky, and further in view of Newbold (Pat. # 5,576,955, 6/7/ 95).

Regarding claim 165, which depends on claim 161, Bradshaw et al disclose: "This fifth library contains words which in ordinary usage are not vulgar or pornographic, but when used in a search request can produce a list of pornographic sites" (Col. 6, lines 44-50). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose *generating a list of substitute words in the event any word is misspelled...determining whether the substituted word has a meaning that is potentially inappropriate*. Newbold et al disclose: "The errors in the Error List can be addressed in any order, and the Error List can be perused multiple times to including additional errors in a group before performing an operation...if the spacing error is bypassed to address a group of errors with acceptable correction suggestions." (Col. 7, lines 8-60, and Col. 4, lines 33-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al, Duffy, and Newbold et al and have checked for the meaning of a word 'that is potentially inappropriate', after having corrected the spelling, because Newbold et al teach that "Error List" could be checked several times to include additional errors such as a word 'that is potentially inappropriate'.

12.   Claims 41-44, 46, 51-53, 57, 60-63, 70-71, 105-110, 112-113, 141-144, 147-148, 150-151, 167-170, 172-173, 177-180, 185-192, and 194-204 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Bradshaw et al (Pat. # 5,835,722, 6/27/ 96), in view of Duffy et al,

hereinafter Duffy (Pat. # 5,911,043, 6/8/ 99, filed 10/1/96).

Regarding claim 41, which depends on claim 40, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out

offensive words in a document through the use of libraries-- (col. 3, lines 4-67, and col. 4, lines

1). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose *software module designates said set of filter words*

by changing a value of a status fields. However, Duffy teaches designating several categories of

offensiveness for words found in a database, by modifying a rating for the word depending on

the context in which the word is found (col.3, lines 48-67, and col. 4, lines 1-67). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined

the teachings of Bradshaw, and Duffy teaches the rating of objectionable documents by

monitoring objectionable words in a document based on the sum of individual word ratings (col.

1, lines 47-67, and col. 2, lines 1-40).

Claims 42-43 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in claim

41, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 41, Bradshaw et al disclose offensive word

libraries being modified by a user, and screening out offensive words in a document through the

use of libraries (as soon as the modified libraries are available for the screening module)-- (col.

3, lines 4-67, and col. 6, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 46, which depends on claim 41, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out

offensive words in a document through the use of libraries-- (col. 3, lines 4-67, and col. 4, lines

1). Duffy teaches designating several categories of offensiveness for words found in a database,

by modifying a rating for the word depending on the context in which the word is found (col.3,

lines 48-67, and col. 4, lines 1-67). Bradshaw et al, and Duffy fail to explicitly disclose *permitting said user to change the value of a status flag for words in said electronic dictionary.* However, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw, and Duffy, because Duffy teaches the customization of a database of word ratings (col. 6, lines 51-67), so as to make it possible for a user to customize the word rating in the database to "satisfy any relevant consideration or emphasis on inappropriate, objectionable, or offensive subject matter".

Claims 51-52 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in claim 41, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 53, and 57 are directed towards an article of manufacture for implementing the system found in claims 41, and 46, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 60, which depends on claim 53, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out offensive words in a document through the use of libraries located in a computer memory— RAM, hard drive, etc-- (col. 3, lines 10-67, and col. 5, lines 3-24).

Claim 61 is directed towards an email system for emailing a document to a plurality of users, and implementing the system found in claims 45-46 respectively, and is therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 62-63, and 70-71 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in claims 46, 41, 41, and 41 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 105-108 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 46, 46, 46, and 41 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 109-110, and 112-113 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in claims (45+46), (45+46), 42, and (45+41) respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 141-144, 147-148, and 150-151 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 46, 42, 43-44, 41, 41, 41, and 41 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 167-170, 172-173, and, 177-178 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in claims 41-44, 46-47, 41, and 40 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 179-180 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 41-42, respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 185, which depends on claim 179, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out offensive words found in word processors, email, etc--"how a user may attempt to create....prohibited material" (Col. 12, lines 22-67, Col. 3, lines 10-67, and Col. 4, lines 6-52). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose: *document is ....an electronic spreadsheet, an electronic database*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Bradshaw et al teach screening out— 'checking'-- words according based on different applications such as word processors, e-mail etc.

Claims 186 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims (41+45) respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 187, which depends on claim 186, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out

offensive words in a document through the use of libraries-- (col. 3, lines 4-67, and col. 4, lines

1). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose *said rating value and said language sensitivity*

threshold level are adjustable. However, Duffy teaches designating several categories of

offensiveness for words found in a database, and if the word exceeds a specified threshold (such

as 0.0), then the word is marked with an "offensive" rating (col.3, lines 48-67, and col. 4, lines 1-

67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw, and Duffy teaches the rating of

objectionable documents by monitoring objectionable words in a document based on the sum of

individual word ratings (col. 1, lines 47-67, and col. 2, lines 1-40).

Claims 188-189, and 190-191 are directed towards a system for implementing the system

found in claims 46, 41, 187, and 41 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 192, 194-196 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found

in claims 41, 41, 46, and 41 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 197-198 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in

claims (41+45), and 41 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 199, Bradshaw et al disclose *a computer readable storage*

structure for storing a word-- "The interface with the user is provided by a monitor display and

data is entered" (Col. 5, lines 3-67). Bradshaw et al teach the storage of a word(s) checking

module for checking word having inappropriate meaning(s).

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose "X-Stop.....monitors data being created ......" (Col. 6,

lines 15-35), and "The 'user' may be a child, student , or company employee......" (Col. 3, lines

4-6, Col. 6, lines 3-67). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose: *a language filter consisting of*

a first language filter and a second language filter. However, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had this filter, because

Bradshaw et al teach "custom libraries may be provided for security or business applications"

(Col. 6, lines 15-67).

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose "X-Stop.....monitors data being created ......" (Col. 6,

lines 15-35), and "The 'user' may be a child, student , or company employee......" (Col. 3, lines

4-6, Col. 6, lines 3-67), and "custom libraries may be provided for security or business

applications" (Col. 6, lines 15-67). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose: *said first language*

filter and second language filter are part of an electronic dictionary file ... identified by a first

value ... a second value. Duffy teaches designating several categories of offensiveness for words

found in a database (col.3, lines 48-67, and col. 4, lines 1-67). However, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the

filters of Bradshaw et al, and the filter—database—of Duffy this filter, because Bradshaw et al

teach Bradshaw et al teach "custom libraries may be provided for security or business

applications" (Col. 6, lines 15-67).

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose *(i-iii)*--"the third library contains prohibited words,

i.e., profane and vulgar words, racial slurs and epithets...X-Stop.....monitors data being created

" (Col. 6, lines 15-67), and "The 'user' may be a child, student , or company employee" (Col. 3,

lines 4-6), and "Alternate blocking routines may include routines that.....intervening with only a

temporary warning screen, or audible warning" (Col. 9, lines 32-36). Bradshaw et al teach the

monitoring words which would be offensive to a group of individual—gender based, ethnic, etc--

by selecting appropriate library or filter for triggering an indicator, and filtering such

inappropriate words.

Furthermore, Bradshaw et al disclose: *wherein dissemination of the electronic document*

can be controlled based on whether words contained therein are appropriate for an intended

audience--"X-Stop.....monitors data being created ......The blocking routine is designed to

prevent any further user of the computer system by a user" (Col. 6, lines 15-67), and "The 'user'

may be a child, student , or company employee......E-mail can be controlled by prohibiting E-

mail to certain addresses" (Col. 3, lines 4-67). Bradshaw et al teach the selection of a language

filter based on the <u>type of recipient using computer's software: email, video game, vulgarity,</u>

<u>files accounts, etc--a recipient by recipient basis</u>. Bradshaw et al also teach preventing a user

from using a computer where offensive word(s) have been detected based on the user(s) having

access to such word(s).

Claim 200 is directed towards a system for implementing the system found in claim 199,

and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 201-202 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in

claims 199-200 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 203-204 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in

claims 199-200 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

13.   Claim 149 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw et al,

in view of Duffy, and further in view of Ishikawa (Pat. # 5,812,863, 9/22/ 98, filed 9/26/94).

Regarding claim 149, which depends on claim 148, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out

offensive words in a document through the use of libraries-- (col. 3, lines 4-67, and col. 4, lines

1). Bradshaw et al, and Duffy fail to explicitly disclose *said first context and said second context are based on word meanings of two different languages.* Ishikawa teaches: "correcting the misspelling and incorrect usage of a word whereby the misspelling and improper usage of a word can be found and corrected properly....irrespective of the language used in the document" (col. 3, lines 8-67, and col. 2, lines 11-67). However, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw, Duffy, and Ishikawa, because Ishikawa teaches above the spell checking and correction of a document if the language being prepared is different from the mother tongue of the author.

14.   Claims 48-49, 55-56, 67-68, 152-159, 174-175, 183, and 193 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw et al (Pat. # 5,835,722, 6/27/ 96), in view of Duffy, and further in view of Newbold et al (Pat. # 5,576,955, 6/7/ 95).

Regarding claim 48, which depends on claim 47, Bradshaw et al disclose: "This fifth library contains words which in ordinary usage are not vulgar or pornographic, but when used in a search request can produce a list of pornographic sites" (Col. 6, lines 44-50). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose *generating a list of substitute words in the event any word is misspelled...determining whether the substituted word has a meaning that is potentially inappropriate.* Newbold et al disclose "The errors in the Error List can be addressed in any order, and the Error List can be perused multiple times to including additional errors in a group before performing an operation...if the spacing error is bypassed to address a group of errors with acceptable correction suggestions." (Col. 7, lines 1-60, and Col. 4, lines 33-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al, Duffy, and Newbold et al and have checked for

the meaning of a word 'that is potentially inappropriate', after having corrected the spelling,

because Newbold et al teach that "Error List" could be checked several times to include

additional errors such as a word 'that is potentially inappropriate'.

Regarding claim 49, which depends on claim 40, Bradshaw et al disclose: "This fifth

library contains words which in ordinary usage are not vulgar or pornographic, but when used in

a search request can produce a list of pornographic sites" (Col. 6, lines 44-50). Bradshaw et al

fail to explicitly disclose *checking a set of documents, and generating a list of words in such*

documents that are in said set of filter words. Newbold et al disclose "The errors in the Error List

can be addressed in any order, and the Error List can be perused multiple times to including

additional errors in a group before performing an operation" (Col. 7, lines 8-60, and Col. 4, lines

33-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al, Duffy, and Newbold et al and

have checked 'a list of documents' with 'potentially inappropriate' words, because Newbold et al

teach that "the present invention is illustrated using textual data" (Col. 3, lines 51-54), such as a

'list of documents' to handle errors (lines 19-20).

Claim 55 is directed towards an article of manufacture for implementing the system

found in claim 48, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 56, which depends on claim 55, Bradshaw et al disclose screening out

offensive words in a document through the use of libraries-- (col. 3, lines 4-67, and col. 4, lines

1). Bradshaw et al fail to explicitly disclose *to determine whether said replacement word has an*

appropriateness rating that exceeds said threshold value for such document. However, Duffy

teaches designating several categories of offensiveness for words found in a database, and if the word exceeds a specified threshold (such as 0.0), then the word is marked as offensive (col.3, lines 48-67, and col. 4, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw, Duffy, and Newbold, because Duffy teaches the rating of objectionable documents by monitoring objectionable words in a document based on the sum of individual word ratings (col. 1, lines 47-67, and col. 2, lines 1-40).

Claims 67-68 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in claims 48-49 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 152-155 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 48, 48, 48, 48, and 48 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 156, which depends on claim 152, Bradshaw et al disclose offensive word libraries being modified by a user, and screening out offensive words in a document through the use of libraries (as soon as the modified libraries are available for the screening module)-- (col. 3, lines 4-67, and col. 6, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 157, which depends on claim 152, Bradshaw et al disclose: *generating an alert indicating that such word is potentially inappropriate*— "Alternate blocking routines may include routines that.....intervening with only a temporary warning screen, or audible warning" (Col. 9, lines 32-36). Bradshaw et al teach that "the X-Stop monitoring system" could have also given visual or audible warning to the user about the presence of an "offensive"-- 'potentially inappropriate'--word.

Regarding independent claim 158, Bradshaw et al disclose "the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words" (Col. 3, lines 4-67). Newbold et al disclose "a spelling checker scans text to identify errors...." (Col. 1, lines 22-26). Bradshaw et al and Newbold et al fail to explicitly disclose *A method of permitting an author... to simultaneously check the spelling and meaning of words.* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al, and Newbold et al, because Newbold et al teach "......proof reading engine used to scan the text. Possible error types are: spelling, usage, custom usage........." (Col. 4, lines 16-18), such as the usage of an 'potentially inappropriate' words as taught by the present invention.

In addition, Bradshaw et al disclose "the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words......" (Col. 3, lines 4-67). Bradshaw et al fail to teach '[a] retrieving a word to be spell checked.....'. Newbold et al disclose "....a spelling checker scans text to identify errors, communicates the error...." (Col. 1, lines 22-26). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al, and Newbold et al, because Newbold et al teach "......proof reading engine used to scan the text. Possible error types are: spelling, usage, custom usage........." (Col. 4, lines 16-18), such as the usage of an 'potentially inappropriate' words as taught by the present invention.

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose "the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words......" (Col. 3, lines 4-67). Bradshaw et al fail to teach '[b] determining whether said word has been spelled correctly...'. Newbold et al disclose

"....a spelling checker scans text to identify errors ...." (Col. 1, lines 22-26). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al, and Newbold et al, because Newbold et al teach "......proof reading engine used to scan the text. Possible error types are: spelling, usage, custom usage........." (Col. 4, lines 16-18), such as the usage of an 'potentially inappropriate' words as taught by the present invention.

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose "....the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words......" (Col. 3, lines 4-67), and "monitor data being passed into and out of the topmost application and compare the data stored to that stored in libraries...The third library contains prohibited words, i.e., profane and vulgar words, racial slurs and epithets, as well as any other words that a supervisor may wish to have intercepted" (Col. 6, lines 2-67). Bradshaw et al teach the selection of a language filter on the type of recipient using a computer, email, video game, vulgarity, files accounts, etc--a recipient by recipient basis Bradshaw et al fail to teach '[c] when said word has been spelled incorrectly, presenting a first list of alternative words to said user.....'. However, Newbold et al disclose "For example, the user could quickly scan the Error List selecting errors with acceptable correction suggestions......." (Col. 4, lines 56-58). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bradshaw et al, and Newbold et al, because Newbold et al teach "......proof reading engine used to scan the text. Possible error types are: spelling, usage, custom usage" (Col. 4, lines 16-18), such as the usage of an 'potentially inappropriate' words as taught by the present invention.

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose "….the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words……" (Col. 3, lines 4-67). Bradshaw et al fail to teach '[d] determining whether the …..replacement word has a designation as offensive and /or potentially inappropriate ……..'. However, Newbold et al disclose "For example, the user could quickly scan the Error List selecting errors with acceptable correction suggestions……." (Col. 4, lines 56-58). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of searching for an 'inappropriate word' as taught by Bradshaw et al in the quote above, and replacing a misspelled word with an "acceptable suggestions" as taught by Newbold et al in the quote above, because Newbold et al teach "……proof reading engine used to scan the text. Possible error types are: spelling, usage, custom usage………." (Col. 4, lines 16-18), such as the usage of an 'potentially inappropriate' words as taught by the present invention.

Moreover, Bradshaw et al disclose "….the use of words inappropriate for a key word search are screened out along with offensive words……" (Col. 3, lines 4-67). Bradshaw et al fail to teach '[e] when said word has been designated as potentially inappropriate, presenting a second list of alternative words ……..'. However, Newbold et al disclose "For example, the user could quickly scan the Error List selecting errors with acceptable correction suggestions……." (Col. 4, lines 56-58). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of searching for an 'inappropriate word' as taught by Bradshaw et al in the quote above, and replacing a misspelled word with an "acceptable suggestions"—'second list of alternative words'-- as taught by Newbold et al in the quote above, because Newbold et al teach "……proof reading engine used to scan the text.

Possible error types are: spelling, usage, custom usage..........." (Col. 4, lines 16-18), such as the

usage of an 'potentially inappropriate' words as taught by the present invention.

Claim 159 is directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims

(48+158) and is therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 174-175 are directed towards a system for implementing the system found in

claims 48, and 49 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 183, and 193 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in

claims 48, (41+48) and are therefore similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

15.   In a telephonic interview conducted on 9/6/01 Mr. J. Nicholas Gross Reg. 34,175

indicated to the Examiner his approval for canceling claims 40-52 depending upon the allowance

of claims 53-58, 60-63, 66-71,105-114 and 141-204, which was not possible because of a new

prior art reference discovered by the Examiner during an updated search required for allowing

the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

16.   The allowance of claims 53-71, 105-114, and 141-204 have been withdrawn in light of

the newly found prior art found while updating prior art document search necessary for

conducting an allowance.

17.   The objections of claims 41-44, 46, 51-52, as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, and which would have been allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims given a updated search did not yield

relevant prior art, have been withdrawn in light of the newly found prior art found while

updating prior art document search necessary for conducting an allowance.

Conclusion

I.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. RUSSELL-FALLA et al. (Pat. # 6,266,664 B1).

II.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at

least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

>   Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

>   Washington, D.C. 20231

   Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

>   Or:

- (703) 308-6606, (for informal or draft communications for discussion only, please label

  "**PROPOSED**" or "**DRAFT**").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

9/17/01

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER